It is however, possible to show how the refugee population has been reduced on a district and agency basis. See Table 1.

TABLE 1:

Refugee Numbers and Locations (by District and Agency)

	Number Refugees(*) 1989 '000	Number Refugees(**) 1994 '000	% Reduction
NWFP			
Peshawar(1&2)	512	164	-67%
Mardan	106	33	-69%
Kohat	232	139	-40%
Karak	-	-	
Abbottabad/Har	143	79	-44%
Mansehra	72	48	-33%
Kohistan	-	-	
Bannu	73	41	-43%
D.I.Khan	88	49	-44%
Chitral	38	18	-52%
Dir	89	52	-41%
Swat	14	6	-57%
Malakand	55	17	-69%
Sub-Total:	1,609	696	-56%
FATA			
Bajaur	198	81	-59%
Mohmand	16	-	
Khyber	-	-	
Orakzai	13	9	-33%
Kurram	348	174	-50%
N.Waziristan	184	65	-64%
S.Waziristan	58	33	-43%
Sub-Total:	633	362	-42%

(*) from UNDP 1990 report "Recovery and Rehabilitation of Areas Affected by Afghan Refugees". No source cited. [Annex #16, page 75].

(**) from The Secretary, Government of Pakistan, SAFRON,

Islamabad, "Population Statement for the Period Ending 22nd November, 1994." [Annex 3]

Map C

Camp Locations, Land Ownership, Tenure

5.6) Locations

The paper by Nigel Allan [Annex 6], refers to the refugee camps as having been placed by the government, "the Pakistan government now realizes the folly of having located refugees in prime forest areas. The basis for this original policy is unknown...". But Pakistani officials interviewed for the current study say no government plan existed. As already mentioned on page six, refugees made the choices. "It was an emergency, there was no time to make a plan", confirmed Sadar Wazir Mohammad, Director of the Forestry Co-ordination office. Refugees settled where they wanted, more or less. If they had livestock, they chose places with water and fodder. If they were skilled labourers they moved closer to cities and found empty spaces.

As can be seen by Map C, camps are clustered close to passes in the mountains. Generally, refugees did not use the roads for their escape, due to the blockades and dangers, but crossed overland back to the roads once inside Pakistan.

The UNDP report (described later) puts it this way, "Refugee settlements are typically clustered together or are within close proximity of one another giving rise to large concentrations of Afghans adjoining commercial centres, or wedged in strips of common lands in agricultural areas. As a result, the total removal of vegetation in zones up to 3 km. and more around such settlement areas is common." [page 320]

5.7) Land Ownership

According to the "Environmental Profile of the NWFP" [Annex 14, page 5] "more than 60% of the land of NWFP is under some form of common property ownership or use". This kind of land, called "shamilot", literally means that which does not belong to you or me. It is common land, traditionally managed and used jointly by villagers. Most refugee settlements which became camps are located on this kind of land. However, several sources cite problems now exist about shamilot land.

According to the current Director General of the Environment Protection Agency, by definition all vast uninhabited lands are state lands. If the land has no private title, it is state owned. This makes a very thin line between government owned and what is at least understood to be community owned or "common" land. This problem existed long before the refugees but they have helped add to the confusion.

People of the NWFP are predominantly of the Pushtoon (Pathan or Pukhtoon) ethnic group. In this tribal society, land is an especially complicated subject, not even counting refugees into the picture. To see how complex this issue is, refer to Annex 7, "Cultural Values, Land Management and Land Degradation". It states in brief that [page 20] "uncontrolled (land) use caused by power plays...leads to a downward spiral in ... vegetation."

Other samples [Annex 7, page 8]:

"In the case of the Pukhtoon, land management is a dynamic process and not an arrangement that can be made once and for all, since it depends on the changing social relationships in the Pukhtoon villages."

"Fluid relationships based on ceaseless conflicts to gain power and prestige, irrespective if they are related to land management or not, make it very difficult for competing leaders and other stakeholders to sit together and compromise a.o. on land management; despite the fact that they are all shareholders in the same areas and their interests regarding the area are intertwined. Compromise is, however, seen as a weakness and not as a strength..."

4.8) Land Tenure

Tenure, so far as Afghans are concerned, does not seem to be a matter of concern. However, in NWFP there are "three distinct categories of tenurial arrangements; owner, owner-cum-tenant and tenant. Most tenants are sharecroppers. Fifty to 60% of the crop goes to the landowner depending on inputs (water) by the landlord [source: pg.32, Annex 14, Environmental Profile].

The refugees are neither land owners (forbidden by law) or as far as can be ascertained, sharecropping tenants. They live on common or other land and sell their services cheaply as labourers. This is a subject highly relevant to the future. If some Afghans stay permanently in Pakistan, how will tenure be affected?

4.9) Land Cover

Comparing the "Vegetation Map of NWFP" [page 14, Annex 14] with the map locating camps (Map C), camps appear to be mainly on land which is dry temperate forest, sub-tropical sub-humid forest and tropical thorn forest. What this means in real terms can best be known by visits to the areas (outside the scope of this Eco-Study).

Camps have been located on all land types; forested areas, "barrani (rainfed) farm land only periodically cultivated and much common grazing land was settled [page 35, Annex 16]. Nigel Allan's paper refers to the folly of locating so many camps in

forested areas. There are other camps on completely barren land, with not even a blade of grass.

6) Ecological Effects: Type, Location, Severity

6.1) General Findings

Given that quite a lot is said about refugees doing ecological damage, relatively little research and documentation has been done on the subject.

Despite extensive inquiries (see list of Meetings, Discussions, Contacts) only two documents could be located that are specifically on the subject of the environmental impact of Afghan refugees on Pakistan. The Peshawar ACBAR library/resource centre which houses the largest collection of material on Afghan refugees and Afghanistan in the war era, has nothing in its collection on the subject at hand.

Located elsewhere through IUCN was one four page article by Prof. Nigel Allan of Louisiana State University, USA [Annex 6]. The second document is the "Recovery and Rehabilitation of Areas Affected by Afghan Refugees," [Annex 16] commissioned and published by UNDP/Pakistan in 1990. At 492 pages, it was prepared by an eight member expatriate mission from three months of research, "in the areas most affected by the refugees". Unfortunately, the report is difficult to follow. For example, only 71 of its 492 pages are outlined in the main table of contents; sometimes contradictory information is given and information that should be given together is spread very far apart. In addition, one consultant's itinerary is included [pg.240] and it shows travel around the NWFP on field visits but not a single mention is made in the report of first-hand observation or visual verification of damage reported by government officials, odd given that baseline data was known to be so scarce. Finally, although it ends up emphasizing infrastructure rather than ecological restoration, it is used as the main reference for this "Eco-Study".

A third publication written by the Government of NWFP Planning, Environment and Development Department in 1993 could not be located due to filing problems in the PE&D department. This 41 page paper, "Economic Recovery and Rehabilitation of Areas in Pakistan Affected by Afghan Refugees", from the Pakistani viewpoint would have been of value and still should be located if possible. Annex 8, "Memorandum on Relief Assistance for Afghan Refugees in Pakistan" is included as a close substitute. As the Annex list shows, a few other related sources were found.

In summary, no inventory of ecological damage caused by Afghans in the NWFP is known to exist. It may exist in bits and pieces in field reports, needs assessments or old proposals or plans filed away in offices around the province but it has never been

compiled and there is no master list of damage. Lists hastily compiled by forestry officials in response to this "Eco Study" may be the closest thing there is to an inventory. But these lists still are not about the type of damage, severity or exact location. Like all other sources, it is a vague list of projects needed to repair the unidentified damage.

As background to the UNDP study: it was commissioned following a government of Pakistan appeal to the international community in 1989 for assistance to restore environmental damage once refugees repatriated. That year, 1989, was a high point in regional history in that the Soviet troops had completed their withdrawal from Afghanistan in February. As a massive repatriation was foreseen, Pakistan wanted help.

That UNDP study was to be "a comprehensive survey of the damage caused by the refugees and a strategy for repair" relating to the agricultural sector with particular reference to the degradation of forest lands; restoration of rangelands and watersheds; rehabilitation of roads, irrigation channels and drinking water reservoirs [page 8, Annex 16].

As a result, the UNDP study suggests for the NWFP, $69 million worth of high priority projects and $53 million worth of medium and low priority projects. [page 15, Annex 16]. These are in roads, irrigation, public health engineering and vegetative rehabilitation.

The report puts roads as number one priority, far ahead of others, but the explanation is weak. The only reason given for spending at least twice as much on roads as vegetation is, "road repair projects show extremely high rates of return" [page 12, Annex 16].

In any case, sources state that Pakistan has had serious environmental problems long before the refugees arrived and far outside refugee areas. The UNDP report says [page 202], "Pakistan was facing a massive environmental crisis long before refugee arrival. Deforestation, heavy grazing pressure and inappropriate farming practices were for decades commonplace in the upland watersheds and arid lowland ranges. Years of such abuse accelerated surface run-off, soil erosion, downstream siltation and loss of land productivity. Flash flooding deposited enormous quantities of soil in downstream dams, irrigation works and farmlands." Nigel Allen's paper [Annex 6] describes how the damage began in the last century and was accelerated after partition in 1947.

All sources consulted, verbal and written, express difficulty in getting accurate information. No baseline studies were done before refugee arrival so effects of the refugees are not exactly known in any subject, environmental or otherwise. UNDP [page 10] says, restoration "is not just a question of going back to the status quo. In most cases this is not known." And, "it is difficult, if not impossible, to say how much of this damage is

due to the refugees, or has occurred in the last ten years, i.e. in the presence of the refugees."

And there are inconsistent views on what information **is** available. In 1987 Nigel Allan refers to using "LANDSAT imagery, 1:50,000 Pakistan Forestry maps, 1:250,000 AMS topographic sheets from 1958 and more recent good 1:250,000 Survey of Pakistan topographic sheets". But the UNDP report written three years later states, "There are no useful maps of the forest cover nor data on the carrying capacity of rangelands as they were ten years ago. Thus, there is no standard on the basis of which it would be possible to say what has happened in the last ten years." [pg.10, Annex 16). In discussions with officials it became very clear that whatever information exists, it is not shared and co-ordinated. Where it exists, it is mainly in the hands of foreign experts and the agencies for whom they work.

With such a shortage of reliable information it is not surprising then that there is speculation that damage is sometimes exaggerated. [page 327, Annex 16] "A number of donor agency field staff (English 1989) believe that reports of the widespread denudation and degradation attributed to refugees are exaggerated and are location specific. This view has some support in the private sector but not by Government officials. There is little doubt that refugees have accelerated the draw-down of fuel wood sources, have affected prices and have completely denuded areas adjacent to settlements of any combustible material"...

6.2) Trees, Forests

Getting to the subject, the UNDP report theorizes that the equivalent of 44,000 hectares of forest has been consumed by the refugees in NWFP. This was calculated by the forest department based on refugee per capita consumption of one cubic metre per year of firewood. At 2.2 million refugees in NWFP, this amounts to 22 million cubic metres in 10 years. In NWFP, upland coniferous forests are assumed to contain about 500 cubic metres per hectare. At this rate 44,000 hectares would need to be re-planted to make up for the loss. In fact, the report points out, most of the wood was taken from remnants of already degraded forests, scrub forests and shrubs. [page 203, Annex 16]

Nigel Allan mentions a survey undertaken in 1985 to establish the extent of deforestation between southern Chitral district east to the Abbottabad and Mansehra districts. Four areas "seriously deforested" by refugees were identified in Chitral, Dir, Bajaur and Mansehra (see map in Allan's paper).

The same area is treated with major concern by the UNDP study. It says, [page 216] "the degraded watersheds qualifying for post Afghan refugee rehabilitation take in huge upland tracts of NWFP draining into the Kabul River from the Malakand Division and into the Indus River above Tarbela dam from the Hazara Division.

These watersheds used to be covered by forests which were being lost to commercial exploitation well before the refugees arrived but concentrated refugee presence in many of the valleys has seriously aggravated an already bad situation". Most of this area is almost barren. Run-off water from these steep slopes is carrying silt loads into the Tarbela reservoir, shortening its useful life." In response, the UNDP report recommends 13,600 ha hillside planting and erosion control in both Hazara and Malakand Divisions.

About forest damage, the UNDP study says, [page 204] "Regarding the quantification of resource damage in these (refugee) localities, forest departments are not able to provide specific data about stocks of wood or vegetative cover that existed 10 years ago. They can supply only descriptive generalizations... Assessing the geographic extent and intensity of the widespread damage is in fact not easy. Direct measure of changes in vegetative cover could be done by comparing recent aerial photographs in sample areas with photos taken prior to refugee influx, but Pakistan's internal security makes access to aerial photographs almost impossible".

The trouble is, the above statement implies that recent aerial photos may exist, but do they? If the UNDP consultants knew such photos exist, they were not identified and in any case, like stated, are inaccessible anyway. This access problem was known five years ago when the UNDP study was done and they continue up to today. For instance, restriction on new aerial photography was a crucial factor influencing the choice of technology in the Swiss assisted Forest Management Centre support programme. However in the recently concluded ADB forestry sector project there were indications that opposition to new aerial might be subsiding but this has yet to be tested in practice.

The fact is that the Aerial Forest Inventory Project, carried out between 1967 and 1973, did take aerial photos of parts of the NWFP and these historical photos are believed to be housed, ironically, within the Forest Management Centre of the NWFP Forest Department. In 1995, access to them remains restricted.

If concrete evidence or proof is needed that refugees did certain exact damage, the closest to this that could be located by this study is in some documentation with the GTZ Siran Forest Development Project in the Abbottabad area. Project personnel have an aerial photo and two satellite images showing the location of one refugee camp. The aerial photo was taken before the camp was established and the two satellite images of the camp site were shot in later years. Together, these visuals suggest that this camp has had a severe adverse impact on the vegetation of the area. Verification on the ground would likely confirm this. Unfortunately copies offered of the photo and satellite images could not be obtained before the deadline of this report, but would be available in future.

Even though information about damage is sketchy, the UNDP study does go on to list 21 forestry projects needed to restore a total of 41,500 hectares, etc (see pg.19). How these were identified is not specified but appear to come from the "45 sub-projects proposed by the NWFP Forest Department" [page 209]. The 21 projects listed contain no information about the exact location, type or severity of damage. The projects are also presented as five "packages", or projects grouped together for Hazara Division, Malakand and the southern region of NWFP [page 221, Annex 16].

6.7) UNDP Recommendations

The UNDP report also lists "Factors Influencing Success of the Programme". Very valuable advice is given here to funding agencies [see pages 207/8 and 348/9 for more detail]:

a) Serious land rehabilitation should be undertaken only in areas from where refugees have departed. Realistic time (ie.5 years) must be allowed for rehabilitation to work. Growing, planting, establishing and maintenance of seedlings takes time and continuity. "Discontinuity of funding brought about by sub-projects being too short severely constrains ...tree planting efforts."

b) Technologies to be used must be appropriate and used with close scrutiny.

c) The Forestry department must include local people in (these) decisions that affect them.

d) Assistance in planning, supervision and monitoring is essential.

e) Projects should avoid the simple 'block planting' approach of the IGP" (IGPRA/World Bank/UNHCR).

f) ...Planting and reseeding should only be undertaken on high potential sites where future social management promises to be reasonably disciplined.

Further detail is given about priority target areas, rehabilitation strategies, closure of lands, needs for fencing, land management, and rehabilitation treatments in different areas; upland degraded watersheds, agricultural lands, arid wastelands riverine lands, etc.

6.3) Afforestation Needs

Suggested by UNDP. [Source: Annex 16, summary of pages 263-297]

NWFP:

Abbottabad District:
1.-1200 Ha block planting in Khanpur Dam Catchment
2.-3600 Ha block and 144 Km linear planting in Haripur
3.-3200 Ha planting in Sherwan
4.-2400 Ha planting in Soka Nullah
Mansehra District:
5.-1600 Ha planting in Bareri Khaki
6.-3200 Ha planting in Chiryali Kehnian
Chitral District:
7.-800 Ha block planting and 50 km of linear planting
Swat District:
8.-2400 Ha planting in Malam Jabba and Miandam
9.-2800 Ha planting in Buner
Bannu District:
10.-2000 Ha on Gambila River and Doha Khawer
11.-640 km road and canal linear planting
Dir District:
12.-4800 Ha planting
D.I. Khan District:
13.-600 Ha planting in Miran Forest Reserve
14.-800 Ha Planting in Band Peru and Dabara
15.-1300 km road and canal planting
Kohat District:
16.-6000 ha of mazri palm sowing in Hangu
Peshawar District:
17. -3600 Ha planting and sowing in Cherat-Khairabad Hills

Total: -planting and block planting: 38,700 ha
-linear planting: 1,990 km.
-sowing mazri palm: 6,000 ha

FATA:

Bajaur Agency:
18.-2800 Ha block planting and 50 km linear planting
Kurram Agency:
19.-3000 ha of mazri palm sowing
North Waziristan Agency:
20. -1500 Ha of mazri palm sowing
Orakzai Agency:
21. -1000 ha of mazri palm sowing

Total: -block planting: 2,800 ha
-linear planting: 50 km

1) Abstract

For well over a decade, the world's largest refugee population has been settled in 250 refugee camps in Pakistan mostly in the North West Frontier Province. Three and a half million refugees spent several years in Pakistan but as of 1994 about half have repatriated.

In some circles, it is thought that the refugees have had a major, adverse ecological impact on the NWFP. Some experts however, state that ecological problems existed long before the refugees arrived and now it is unknown which damage was done by refugees and which by locals. Considering how much this refugee impact is said to be a problem, little actual research has been done on the subject. This study could locate only two documents, an article and a major report which still does not clearly identify exact sites of damage, its type or severity.

Nonetheless, a general picture can be pieced together from the mentioned and other materials, reports, interviews and plans.

Sociological questions about resource management and change are the hardest to answer as no studies on the subject have been identified. It is likely none have been done.

-sowing mazri palm: 5,500 ha

6.4) Rangeland and Natural Pastures

About rangeland the UNDP study [pg.323] says "Well before the arrival of the Afghan refugees, most of the watershed areas of NWFP...had become one of the most mismanaged and severely degraded physical environments in the world. There are no grazing ecosystems in these areas which have escaped degradation to some degree, and it is probable that more than 60% of natural grazing areas now have a primary production no more than half to one third of their potential, and of the rest at least half may be irreversibly lost to hillside, gully or sheet erosion."

Estimates of refugee livestock vary -there is no actual count. "Government estimates are generally about 6 or 7 sheep per family, plus a few cattle and pack animals, but others' estimates are smaller at 2 to 3 animals per family unit [page 321, Annex 16]. At around 300,000 refugee family units (2.2 million divided by 7) in NWFP, this means a minimum of 600,000 to 900,000 animals. In perspective, "refugee animals have added 6% to existing levels in NWFP and 17% in FATA with the major effects being in Kurram and North Waziristan." [page 332, Annex 15].

As in the case of forests, the report refers to lack of baseline data about rangelands. In an attempt to quantify damage, the report says [page 330], "Using very crude visual estimates it is possible that upwards of 42,500 ha of ...shrublands have been seriously depleted", but again does not specify sites.

The UNDP report's section on Rangelands and Pasture is 57 pages but after all that has only a few projects to suggest [page 355-376]. These projects apparently come from those suggested by government:

-an inventory of natural resources
-establishing an ecological monitoring unit ($1,434,000)
-commercial crop development -Mazri Palm Project
-natural pasture rehabilitation project (first 6 yr. $3,898,000)

As mentioned earlier, refugees are mainly on "shamilot" land, which often was the common grazing land of communities. Historically, grazing rights were allocated by a variety of local customs, most of which have broken down under pressure leading to over-use and degradation.

"If the total biomass of refugee animals attributed to each district are added to the small ruminant resident grazing population, then the districts where natural pastures are under serious pressure as a result of refugee animals are Kohat,

Peshawar and Bannu. All of these districts are in the semi-arid to arid ecoclimatic zone. Abbotobad, Malakand and Mardan also showed deficits. However, only in the districts of Chitral and Kohistan, both relatively remote areas with heavy winter snow cover and low population densities, did the total feed available equate with the requirements of the total resident animal biomass. [Annex 16, page 336]

Still, the UNDP report does not specify actual sites that are damaged. Pre-refugee pasture and grazing area data is shown [page 326] but similiar data for the refugee era apparently has not been collected. A map on page 333 shows the distribution of refugee livestock over each district and agency but its author is cautious about its accuracy.

6.5) Water

The UNDP report, while assigned to include it, says very little about drinking water. It says, that "refugee population pressure over the past decade has seriously reduced the availability of water and water quality has suffered due to pollution of ground water sources and springs.... Dense concentrations of people (as in refugee camps) over protracted periods of time without adequate sanitation facilities has resulted in severe pollution of ground water" [page 41]. The report does not specify where these problems exist, or to what extent.

While projects for reafforestation are specified and listed by district and agency, no drinking water projects are specified. Only in the summary [page 18] of public health engineering, a total amount of 123 million rupees is suggested for "tubewell boring and provision of reticulation infrastructure" in NWFP. On page 428, this lack of detail was explained as due to lack of data.

6.6) Water and Soil Conservation

The UNDP study does not deal with water or soil conservation as separate subjects, as might be expected. It appears they are assumed to be included in forestry and rangeland concerns.

7) NWFP Government Plans

In separate meetings, the consultant attempted to get an up-to-date and more clear picture of the damage, the needs and what is being done about it.

Mr. Alamgir Khan Gandapur, Chief of Agriculture, PE&D, told me that there are no agriculture projects planned to restore areas damaged by Afghans. He referred me to the Forestry Department.

According to Mr. Ghani-Ur-Rahman, one of the province's two chief conservator's, his NWFP Forestry Department in the past and now, designs projects specifically for areas affected by refugees. Some of these projects already have been completed under the World Bank/UNHCR, Income Generating Project for Refugee Areas (IGPRA). Mr. Rahman stated that during phases one and two of this project 113,000 acres (45,831 ha) of trees have been planted. Now, in the third phase of the IGPRA, 16 projects totalling another 10,000 acres (4,017 ha) are being planted.

Rahman explained that rangeland management is included in the mandate of the Forestry Department but, except for two cases, they are doing no work at all on rangeland and no other government body has responsibility for it. "At present only trees are being looked after", he said. This is due mainly to shortage of resources. It was not part of the IGPRA project either, the Chief Conservator explained, as those were to be labour intensive projects and range management is not labour intensive (the UNDP report **does** explain rangeland management methods ("microclimatic structures, page 346, which are labour intensive but these apparently have not been considered by the forestry department). However, a new plan (page 24) does include 12,000 acres of new work in rangeland management (see below).

The two exceptions to rangeland work are quite major watershed management projects in the Hazara division and western watershed. These are to conserve the soil and control silting by plantation establishment, improved agriculture methods and range management along the tributaries to the Indus.

In the same meeting, the Conservator's chief of planning and development, Mr. Shabir, provided a master list (page 21) of another 12 sites, totalling 26,000 acres needing restoration. These are locations said to be damaged by refugees. For the record, when supplied this list was entitled, "Statement Showing Viable Projects for the Utilization of Sale Proceeds Money Generated Through the Sale of Afghan Refugees Assets." Upon inquiry, Mr. Shabir explained this list had been drawn up to show what could be done with assets held by UNHCR when it closes as planned at the end of 1995. He said if these forestry projects

wait for this UNHCR financing, they may never happen. He further explained that each of the 12 listed projects had "concept papers" to explain them further. When the samples were finally received [Annex 10, Forestry Department: Sample Concept Papers for Restoration Projects (Dir, Buner and Chitral districts], they appeared to have been written for the purpose of this "Eco-Study" and do not co-incide with the masterlist.

Mr. Sadar Wazir Mohammad, director of the Forestry Department's Co-ordination office provided a "Brief" report [Annex 11] on the Forestry Department's achievement in the Income Generating Projects for Afghan Refugees Areas to date. The Brief says that from the beginning to now, 1984 to the end of September 1994, afforestation totals 129,293 acres (52,321 ha) (a little higher than the chief conservator had said, above). No locations are identified but are available.

For historical purposes, a 1986 report and correspondence is included [Annex 9]. In it, the Foreign Aid Section of Planning and Development Department, Government of NWFP is asking the Forestry department to estimate damage done by Afghans. The Forestry department returns a list stating that 531,200 acres (214,976 hectares) have been damaged by Afghans and should be targeted for afforestation. This information is then re-worked by P&D Department for presentation to donors. (All this material supplied by Co-ordination office).

7.1) Refugee Damage Restoration Projects

identified by the NWFP Forestry Department 1994

No.	Name of Project	Cost '000 rps.	Physical Target			Period
	FATA Agencies					
1.	rehab of env: Kurram	23.140	Nursery:	30	acres	5 yr.
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Sowing:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	2,000	"	"
2.	rehab of env: Bajaur	29.710	Nursery:	50	acres	"
			Planting:	3,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
3.	rehab of env: Mohmand	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
4.	rehab env: N.Wazir	9.630	Nursery:	10	acres	"
			Planting	1,500	"	"
			Range Mgt:	500	"	"
5.	rehab env: S. Wazir	9.630	Nursery:	10	acres	"
			Planting:	1,500	"	"
			Range Mgt:	500	"	"
	NWFP Districts					
6.	rehab of env: Kohat	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
7.	rehab of env: D.I.Khan	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
8.	rehab of env: Dir	27.960	Nursery:	45	acres	"
			Planting:	3,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
9.	rehab of env: Swat	27.960	Nursery:	45	acres	"
			Planting:	3,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
10.	rehab: Abbot/Haripur	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
11.	rehab: Mansehra	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"
12.	rehab: Bannu	19.140	Nursery:	30	acres	"
			Planting:	2,000	"	"
			Range Mgt:	1,000	"	"

Total 242.870 Total Nursery: 370 acres

Total Planting:	26,000 acres (10,522 ha)
Total Range Mgt:	12,000 acres

8.) Positive Ecological Effects

Not all ecological effects of the refugees are negative. In some areas, for example, there are now far more trees than there were before the refugees. It has become quite a common habit, at least in camps north east, east and south east of Peshawar city (where there were few trees) for refugees to plant trees within their own compounds, resulting in virtual forests. One good example of this is Aza Khail camp, 1/2 hour east of Peshawar on the north side of the Grand Trunk road. It is a large camp, about 3 km. long, which now looks like a forested area. These deciduous trees are perhaps around 10 years old and up to 7 metres or more in height. This kind of camp planting is common in many areas where trees are scarce.

There are also isolated reports of refugees converting barren, unused land into working, productive land. One example is reported to exist in near Wana in South Waziristan. Refugees have converted the whole area to fruit orchards.

9) Relations and Resource Management

9.1) Conflict:

All things considered, relations between Afghans and their hosts over the years have remained remarkably peaceful. In past years, when the general atmosphere was very tense due to the Soviet presence in Afghanistan, occasional events occurred which could have strongly turned the local population against the refugees and visa versa but did not. The bombing of an infiltration gallery in Kurram agency, the landing of scud missiles in Mohmand and Bajaur Agencies, and even occasional air strikes from Soviet jets inside Pakistan air space near the border, were not uncommon events as late as 1989. In that era of full scale war, there was quite a strong sense of solidarity with the refugees. This might account for conflict over natural resources to be quite minor, or to be treated as minor. Examples of such conflict can be found but they are relatively rare. For example, a couple of people were killed when Afghans settled on land in Kohat district where mazri palm grew. Locals depended on this plant to make rope, beds, mats, etc. and a fight ensued.

The UNDP report says, "The presence of a large number of refugees has not generated stress between them and their hosts. Despite the fact that in some districts refugees outnumber the local population and in others form a substantial minority, a remarkable level of calm has been achieved."

The lack of outright conflict between Afghans and their hosts, however does not mean there are no problems between them. Since

the beginning, Afghans have been subjected to coersion by some parts of the Pakistani population. This harassment may be growing, along with resentment in both directions, clearly visible by anyone who works closely with the refugees. Last week alone this consultant witnessed two such examples. One day, police were stopping Afghans in the "Town" part of Peshawar, asking for their identity cards and ten rupees. If the Afghans refused or didn't have ten rupees they were sent to the police station across the road (for what, unknown). On a bus to Islamabad, police stopped the bus and searched it, making an Afghan passenger pay 150 rupees for no reason at all. A verbal fight broke out amongst passengers, a mix of Pakistanis and Afghans, for and against treating refugees in such a way.

A point worth knowing in regard to successful environmental restoration is the perception of Afghans, at least influential Afghans, about the impact refugees have had. It is a sensitive issue. Afghans commonly become quite indignant when the subject of ecological damage is even mentioned, mainly it seems for two reasons. First, the obvious one: "what choice did refugees have but cut trees? Were we to freeze?" The second one is not so obvious in Pakistan: extensive cutting of trees <u>inside</u> Afghanistan on order by the "lumber mafia" and others of Pakistan. Afghans do not have much sympathy for environmental degradation in Pakistan, when they know large tracts of trees inside Afghanistan continue to be removed by Pakistanis. Visit lumber yards or dealers selling firewood around Peshawar. The wood is as likely to come from Afghanistan as it is from Pakistan. Yesterday, this consultant dropped by one Peshawar firewood sales yard and asked about the origin of the wood. The seller helpfully explained, "this pile is from Khost (Afghanistan). This is from Shinwari (Afghanistan). That over there is from North Waziristan (Pakistan)".

The point is, there is high demand for scarce resources and both Pakistanis and Afghans contribute to degradation. Both Pakistanis and Afghans cut trees in Pakistan <u>and</u> Afghanistan and sell the wood to each other.

Questions about changed behavior in resource management, relationships for resource management and changed management patterns require research beyond the scope of this study. These are complex subjects in a complex society.

<u>10) Further Research Needed</u>

1. The UNDP study is five years old. In this time, what further deforestation has occurred and what has been repaired? Were any of the suggested projects carried out? When exact sites were not listed, this will be difficult to identify.

2. With over a million refugees remaining in Pakistan what, if anything, could be done to prevent further environmental damage?

3. Clearly, reliable baseline data is not available in most cases. Future funders will need to decide how important this is before proceeding with other projects. Should next projects be preceeded by surveys to collect the data needed?

11.) Organisations/Services in Concerned Areas and in Field of Afghan Refugees:

11.1) GOVERNMENT:

a) Re: Environment:

-see pages 6 and 7 in Annex 15 [Environmental Profile Appendices] for federal and provincial government departments, etc.

b) Re: Refugees:

Federal: -Chief Commissionerate of Afghan Refugees (Islamabad)
-States and Frontier Regions (SAFRON)
-Economic Affairs

Provincial: -Commissionerate of Afghan Refugees (Peshawar)

11.2) AID PROGRAMMES:

An odd arrangement exists in Pakistan: two completely separate sets of aid programmes; one for Pakistan and one for Afghanistan. During the Soviet occupation and continuing now for security reasons; UN offices, bilateral programmes and NGOs working on Afghanistan are located in Islamabad or Peshawar. Unfortunately, between the two sets of aid programmes there is no communication, co-ordination or co-operation. This may help explain some other gaps.

a) Income Generating Project for Refugee Areas (IGPRA), Phase I, II, III: (1984-94). This ten year World Bank funded project, meant to provide employment to Pakistanis and Afghans and restore environmental damage, was due to expire but has been extended to the end of 1995. Another project, "Natural Resource Management in Refugee Affected Areas" is being designed by the current IGPRA staff. It will a)identify areas which have been damaged by the protracted presence of refugees which need to be rehabilitated; b)repairing infrastructure and other assets in the vicinity of refugee occupied areas; and c) introducing sustainable strategies and programs for the management of natural resources.

b) Other Major Donor-Funded Environment Projects In Pakistan

see pages 9-15 in [Annex 13, the Environmental Profile Appendices] which list 51 projects. These are not refugee projects.

c) United Nations:

At last count, there were 22 UN agencies stationed in Pakistan which work on Afghanistan. Their co-ordinating body, UNOCHA (United Nations Office of Co-ordination for Humanitarian Assistance for Afghanistan) is located in Islamabad. The number of UN agencies working on Pakistan was not identified.

Recently in the media it has been stated that UNHCR will close in Pakistan at the end of 1995. UNHCR officials, however, state that this is not true.

d) Non Government Organisations

In future restoration work, NGOs may be suitable implementing partners. In the NWFP there is a large selection.

Pakistani Non-Government Organizations (NGOs):

Indigenous NGOs are rapidly growing in number in the NWFP and those which include environment in their mandate may be growing proportionately. However, not enough information is known about any of these NGOs. The same consultant recently concluded a study for the Frontier Education Foundation/NWFP Ministry of Education to identify NGOs in the province. Except for a "Directory of Local NGOs, Northwest Frontier Province", published by Coverdale Inc. in 1993, no other such studies have been known to be done. The consultant found that there are 3,000 NGOs registered with the four main departments of government where NGOs may register. The number is deceiving however, as it includes all registrations as far back as 1860 when the Societies' Registration Act was enacted. The trouble is, once a registration occurs no follow-up happens, so no-one knows how many NGOs still actually exist or what they do. In any case, the Coverdale Directory lists 233 NGOs, 43 of which say they have environment in their mandate. These have been included as Annex #13.

Major Pakistani NGOs:

A few of these NGOs have gained prominence along with experience in many sectors including environment. They operate in some of the same districts and/or agencies in which there are refugees:

-Aga Khan Rural Support Programme: Chitral district
-has 560 village organisations and 164 women's organisations
-Contact: Masood ul-Mulk, Director
tel: (Chitral) 0533-2979 or 2720

-Sungi Development Foundation: Haripur, Abbottabad, Mansehra districts. Has 126 village organisations
-Contact: Omar Asghar Khan, Director
tel: (Islamabad) 051-2562323, 256330 or 852263

-Sarhad Rural Support Corporation: Mansehra, Kohat, Charsada, Karak districts. Has 250 village organisations
-Contact: Tariq Durrani, Director
109, Street 2-B, Defense Colony, Peshawar
tel: (Peshawar) 0521-273731 or 274540

Refugee Assisting NGOs in NWFP:

As Afghans grew into the largest refugee population in the world, international relief agencies arrived to assist them. Between 1980 and 1989 assistance was provided almost exclusively in the refugee camps. For those years, little help was provided inside Afghanistan as relief agencies were forbidden by the Kabul regime and assisting was extremely dangerous.

By 1994, the situation is reversed. Very little work is being carried out in Pakistan in the camps. Since 1989 and the Soviet troop withdrawal, virtually all NGO work has shifted inside Afghanistan while maintaining offices in Peshawar. The shift is due mainly to the changed priorities of funders: to fund work inside Afghanistan, not the refugee camps. At present the Agency Co-ordinating Body for Afghan Relief (ACBAR), the main umbrella group of NGOs, states that of its 71 member NGOs, ten still may be working in the camps. These are listed in ACBAR's annual report for 1993/4 as having "no cross-border activities":

-AgTTP (connected with GTZ)
-Interchurch Aid
-Okenden Venture BEFARE
-an "Afghanized" GTZ spin-off)
-Catholic Relief Services
-Caritas Pakistan
-Asia Foundation
-Help Germany
-Help Afghans Foundation

-Others not listed as working in the camps, but which are known to be doing so are Save the Children-USA and International Rescue Committee.

-The combined total budgets for the 71 NGOs in 1993 was reported at $90 million (ACBAR Annual Report 1993/4).

-Outside ACBAR membership (25 of which are indigenous Afghan NGOs) there are an additional 100 to 200 other indigenous Afghan NGOs.

-The only NGOs which are known to have done environment related projects with Afghans in Pakistan are:

-GTZ (not an NGO but...) extensive work in deforestation prevention; fuel efficient stoves, community bakeries, woodfree housing construction, etc.

- Norwegian Project Office (an "Afghanized" spin-off of the Norwegian Refugee Council). From 1990 to 1994, NPO implemented a project (World Bank/SAFRON funded) where widows were taught how to grow tree seedlings in their own compounds. These were then purchased by NPO and sold to the Forestry Department of

2) Background to This Study:

In 1992, the government of NWFP established an Environment Section in its Planning and Development Department and initiated the preparation of the Sarhad Provincial Conservation Strategy, the NWFP's contribution to the National Conservation Strategy. Later in 1992, the Government of NWFP approached the Swiss Development Corporation in Islamabad to see if they would assess the needs and support measures for economic and environmental rehabilitation of the refugee-affected areas in the province. [Source: original terms of reference, dated June 1994, Annex 12]. The current study is a first step in response to that request.

3) Terms of Reference

In summary the Terms of Reference for this study, carried out in December 1994, were to collect information on Afghan refugees and the ecological impact they have had in the NWFP, including information on;

a) historical overview, with emphasis on the most recent developments in the refugee situation
b) refugee numbers and locations, peak period and now
c) location and population of refugee camps
d) positive and negative ecological effects; type, location severity
e) social factors:
 - -conflicts over resources
 - -changed behaviour in resource management
 - -relationships for resource management
 - -changed management patterns
 - -land tenure

e) organizations or services working in concerned areas and in field of Afghan refugees; fields and main geographic zones. Are these bodies untaking eco-rehabiliation?

The complete Terms of Reference is included as Annex #1.

NWFP. Funding stopped in 1994 but NPO repeating same kind of project only inside Afghanistan with other funding.

-Two Christian missionary groups, SERVE and Shelter Now International, have been involved in tree planting and solar cooking.

12) Annexes:

1. Draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for Eco-Rehabilitation Fact Finding Study

2. UNHCR Afghan Digest No.92, for period Sept.1-Oct.31/94

3. Population Statement for the Period Ending 22nd Nov/94

4. Refugee Village Names, District and RV Codes in NWFP (accompanies "Map D", UNHCR map of 3/90)

5. Article, "Pakistan's Vanishing Forests", News Jan.9/94

6. Impact of Afghan Refugees on the Vegetation Resources of Pakistan's Hindukush-Himalaya, Nigel J.R. Allan

7. Cultural Values, Land Management and Land Degradation, 1994, Frans Werter, Malakand Social Forestry Programme, Pakistan

8. Memorandum on Relief Assistance for Afghan Refugees in Pakistan, 1994-95, States and Frontier Regions (SAFRON) Division, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad, 1994.

9. Forestry Department Estimate of Damage Caused by Refugees, 1986. Source: Forestry Co-ordination office.

10. Forestry Department,Sample Concept Papers for Restoration Projects, 1994. Source: Mr. Shabir, Planning and Development, Forestry Department

11. Brief: Income Generating Projects for Refugee Areas, Phases I, II, III: (1984-1994) NWFP Forestry Department Co-ordination office. Source: same

12. Draft June, 1994, (original) Terms of Reference, Fact Finding Mission for Ecological Rehabilitation of Areas Affected by Afghan Refugees in NWFP: SDC, Islamabad

13. Pakistani "Environment" NGOs in NWFP: excerpted from Directory of Local NGOs, Northwest Frontier Province, 1993, Coverdale Organization Inc.

ANNEX BOOKS PROVIDED SEPARATELY:

14. Environmental Profile of North-West Frontier Province, Pakistan: ("Dutch Profile) 1994, DHV Consultants, Netherlands

15. Environmental Profile of North-West Frontier Province, Pakistan; APPENDICES 1-18: 1994, DHV Consultants, Netherlands. 80 pages

16. Recovery and Rehabilitation of Areas Affected by Afghan Refugees: UNDP/Pakistan, 1990. 492 pages.

13.) REFERENCES:

1. Afghanistan: a Forgotten War Jane Murphy Thomas, 1990. 64 pages. Published by Human Concern International, Canada. (copy available from author or at ACBAR/ARIC library)

2. Humanitarian Assistance Programme for Afghan Refugees in NWFP. December 1985. Mr.Shah Zaman, Incharge Public Relations Cell, Afghan Refugee Commissionerate. (copy at ACBAR/ARIC library)

14.) Meetings, Discussions, Contacts

- Niaz Ahmad, Information officers, UNHCR
- Rafiq, Stephen Fuller, IUCN
- Gerry Neville, Forestry Management Centre

- Charles McFadden, Exec.Director, ACBAR
- searched ACBAR (ARIC) library: no references found (to Afghan refugees and environment in Pakistan)
- Nancy Dupree, Afghanistan and refugee historian, Director ARIC (ACBAR Resource and Information Centre)
- Salimi (Director) and Farida (Project Manager), Norwegian Project Office

- Planning, Environment and Development (PE&D):
    - Chief of Environment: Amanuallah Bangash
    - Chief of Foreign Aid: Mr. Waqar Ayub
    - Chief of Section, Agriculture: Alamgir Khan Gandapur
    - Chief Economist: Mr. Adnan Bashir

- Forestry Department:
    - Chief Conservator: Ghari Ur Rahman
    - Chief of Planning and Development: Mr. Shabir
- Forestry Department, Co-ordination Office:
    - Director: Sadar Wazir Mohammad

- States and Frontier Regions (SAFRON):
    - Deputy Secretary for Refugees: Col. Hedayatullah

- Environmental Protection Agency: Director General, Faridullah Khan (former Chief Commissioner of Afghan Refugees, 1984-85)

- United Nations High Commission for Refugees: Peter Van Kleek, Director, Peshawar office

CONTENTS

3) Executive Summary:

Pakistan has been host to the world's largest refugee population for several years. In 1978, when a communist coup d'etat occurred in Kabul, the flow of refugees began to Iran on the west and to Pakistan on the east. As fighting broke out around the country in opposition to the communist regime, more refugees fled.

By late 1979 fighting had spread so widely that the USSR invaded to prop up the regime. A report by the Government of Pakistan states that in 1980 the number of refugees entering Pakistan was from well over 10,000 per month to 80,000 or 90,000 per month. By 1984, the peak number was reached: about 3.5 million including around 400,000 unregistered refugees.

This number, 3.5 million, was maintained until after the Soviet withdrawal in 1989 but the first major repartiation did not occur until 1992 when Najibullah's communist government fell. That summer over a million Afghans went home from Pakistan. Since then repatriation has slowed but altogether, UNHCR estimates that about half the refugees have gone home.

During these years, refugees have lived in 250 refugee camps which stretch out over several hundred kilometres up and down the length of the North West Frontier Province. Of these, 166 are in the "settled districts" of NWFP and 92 are in the Federally Administered Tribal Agencies (FATA). While half the refugees have gone home no camps are known to have been closed, however, large sections of many camps are empty. Data are provided in this study showing how the refugee population has been reduced district-by-district and agency-by-agency. For instance, the highest refugee repatriation rates are from Peshawar and Mardan districts, 67% and 69% respectively. A map included in this study shows the location of each of the refugee camps, along with a list of camp names.

Other annexes included with the study help illustrate the topography of NWFP: from very high mountains to desert plain to "sub-tropical sub-humid forest" to rainfed and irrigated agricultural land. Refugee camps were created on just about all types of land, but most are on barren, vacant land called "shamilot": land which is either common community land or government owned. The lack of clarity about ownership has lead to many problems about land use and management. This existed long before the refugees, but their presence has added to the confusion. Refugees settled more or less where they found space: camps were not located according to any government plan.

In these past several years a great deal has been said about the ecological damage the refugees have done. Considering how much is said about this subject, relatively little research appears to have been done. Despite extensive inquiries, this study could

locate only two documents on the subject; one a four page article by the American professor Nigel Allan and the other, a major study commissioned by UNDP/Pakistan in 1990.

The 490 page UNDP study, "Recovery and Rehabilitation of Areas Affected by Afghan Refugees", points out that "Pakistan was facing a massive environmental crisis long before refugee arrival. Deforestation, heavy grazing pressure and inappropriate farming practices were for decades commonplace in the upland watersheds and arid lowland ranges." Nigel Allan's article describes how the damage began in the last century and was accelerated after partition in 1947.

All sources consulted, verbal and written, express difficulty in now identifying what damage was one by Afghans and what was done by locals as baseline data does not exist.

However, the UNDP study theorizes that 44,000 hectares of trees would have to be planted to replace those lost to the refugees. This figure was calculated using an firewood estimate commonly used in other countries, that people would use one cubic metre per capita per year. At this rate the 2.2 million refugees in NWFP would have used 22 million cubic metres in 10 years. In the NWFP coniferous forests are assumed to contain about 500 cubic metres per hectare. It is with this basic math that the UNDP study suggests what the main ecological damage might be. The study contains no references to first hand observation.

Even though information is sketchy, the UNDP study contains very valuable advice for future funders. These include such recommendations as undertaking land rehabiliation only in areas from where refugees have departed; and where locals are involved in the decisions and social management. Realistic amounts of time (ie. 5 years) must be funded: growing, planting, establishing of plantations and maintenance of seedlings takes time and continuity, and so on.

The UNDP study does also list 21 suggested forestry projects. In nine of the NWFP districts (excluding FATA projects), 17 projects are suggested for a total of 38,700 hectares of planting (summarized in this study). As exact sites are not identified and the report is five years old, it will be difficult to find out if any of these projects were carried out.

The Foresty Department of the NWFP has prepared a more up-to-date list (provided) of 12 projects needed to repair forest damage done by the refugees. It is for projects in 12 districts and agencies totalling 26,000 acres (10,522 ha) of planting.

A section of the UNDP report is dedicated to rangeland and natural pastures. Again it is stated that graze land damage was severe, well before the refugees. "Well before the refugees, most of the watershed areas of NWFP had become one of the most mismanaged and severely degraded physical environments in the world. There are no grazing ecosystems in these areas which have

escaped degradation to some degree, and it is probable that more than 60% of natural grazing areas now have a production of no more than half to one third their potential. Of the rest, at least half may be irreversibly lost to hillside, gully or sheet erosion." Taking refugee animals into consideration, the UNDP study crudely estimates pasture loss at 42,500 hectares.

The above NWFP Forestry Department list, includes 12,000 acres of range management.

All things considered, relations between Afghans and their hosts over the years have been remarkably peaceful. During the Soviet presence tension was high but there was quite a strong solidarity with the refugees. Conflict over natural resources has occurred but is relatively minor.

A major factor to take into consideration is that forests are a sensitive issue, even with Afghans. While they are blamed by Pakistanis for cutting the trees in Pakistan, forests in Afghanistan are being stripped for sale in Pakistan. The important point is, there is high demand for scarce resources and both Pakistanis and Afghans contribute to degradation. Both Pakistanis and Afghans cut trees in Pakistan and Afghanistan and sell the wood to each other.

Other sociological questions about resource management and change are not possible to answer at this time as research on these subjects is unknown.

About organisations in the NWFP, working in environment or with the refugees; there are many at least on paper but more information is needed about all. Names and contacts of several are listed.

5) Background to the Refugee Situation

Accompanying maps "A" and "B" by the same author [Reference #1] help explain Afghan refugee history. The exodus of refugees to Pakistan and Iran began in April 1978, when the communist coup d'etat occurred in Kabul, placing Nur Mohammad Taraki in power.

"Human rights reports referring to the Taraki period indicate the severe measures taken by him against those who opposed him or his reforms. Amnesty International points out a report issued by Hafizullah Amin (who succeeded Taraki when he was assassinated in September 1979), admitting to 12,0000 deaths of prisoners in Kabul jails between April 1978 and September 1979: Taraki's period. But this number referred only to one jail: the infamous Pul-e-Charki prison near Kabul. Other authorities estimate that another 50,000 to 100,000 people were "disappeared" during this period, the first of several systematic round-ups. Virtually every Kabul family lost members in these purges. In the villages, people considered potential security risks such as religious figures and other people of influence, were taken away and never seen again." [source: Reference #1, page 12]

Fighting broke out around the country in 1978 in opposition to the regime and its troops who were enforcing government reforms. Aerial carpet bombing also began at this time. The regime, to put down the first mass up-rising, carpet bombed the city of Herat and surrounding villages killing up to 20,000 people in one day. By the end of 1979 the resistance was so strong that the Soviets invaded to prop up the regime.

Maps A and B help show what happened next. The Soviets put into effect their scorched earth policy, aerial bombing to create a "cordon sanitaire", surrounding the central part of the country. Out of these areas poured close to 50% of the population.

Refugees fled to Iran and into Pakistan, to the Federally Administered Tribal <u>Agencies</u> (FATA) and the "settled" <u>districts</u> of the North West Frontier Province (NWFP).

A report published by the Commission for Afghan Refugees in 1985 states that "during the first three months of 1980 the number of refugees entering Pakistan amounted to well over 10,000 per month. Later this rate increased to as much as 80,000 a month or an average of 3,000 a day. The 2 million mark was reached in March 1981. By the end of 1981, NWFP and its adjacent tribal area were host to 1,953,913 refugees." [Source: Reference #2, page 2]. By 1984, Afghans were the largest refugee population in the world, 3.5 million in Pakistan and 2.8 million in Iran.

The number of refugees peaked in 1984/85 when aerial bombing was at its height in Afghanistan. 3.5 million including around 400,000 unregistered refugees were settled in the NWFP, Baluchistan, Punjab and Sindh, with the large majority (70%)

staying in the NWFP where they were located in some 250 camp sites.

Maps A and B

5.2) Current Situation

Unfortunately, the only media coverage Afghanistan gets nowadays is about the continuing fighting in Kabul, which has been severe since January of 1994. Five thousand have been killed and tens of thousands injured. As the fighting continues in Kabul, the death and injury rate soars and living conditions get even more deplorable, Kabulis are fleeing to a refugee camp inside Afghanistan, near Jalalabad. This Sharshahi camp, established in 1992 on bald desert land in the hottest part of Afghanistan already is full with 117,000 people. This past autumn a new camp was opened south of Jalabad and by October held 14,000 people. At the end of November about 1,000 persons a day continued to arrive in Jalalabad from Kabul [Annex #2, page 6].

In fact, most of the country is peaceful and reconstruction is going on almost everywhere except Kabul. Compared with, say, ten years ago, rural conditions have improved enormously -at least the aerial bombing has stopped there. Aid missions visiting almost anywhere outside Kabul report widespread activity in rebuilding of houses, markets, canals, agriculture, the economy and life in general. Farm land is being worked again for the first time in 15 years.

In the past, any Afghan could cross into Pakistan as a refugee. This is now not the case, at least at official border crossings. The government of Pakistan now refuses entry to Afghans except those who have valid, official visas: very difficult to obtain.

In 1994, this has resulted in new refugees and those repatriated being almost the same number: 70,000 came into Pakistan, 71,000 went home [source: Annex 2: page 2]

5.3) Repatriation

Refugee numbers remained more or less at the 3.5 million level until 1989 when the Soviets completed their troop withdrawal and repatriation began. It wasn't until 1992, when the communist government fell in Kabul, that major repatriation began.

The general rate of repatriation has slowed considerably. Figures given by UNHCR Encashment programme [Annex 2, page 4] are as follows:

Annual Refugee Repatriation

1990	62,831	
1991	174,279	
1992	1,274,016	
1993	132,627	
1994	27,708	(at 31/10/94)

Total: 1,671,461

Estimated to be remaining in Pakistan: 1,122,090

5.4) Refugee Camps

As can be seen in Map C, page 11 (Afghan Refugee Camps in NWFP, Pakistan 1994), refugee camps were established up and down the NWFP and FATA over a distance of several hundred kilometres.

Large numbers of refugees arrived on foot coming through mountain footpaths as roads were blocked and controlled by the Soviets. They often travelled only at night as attacks by helicopter gun ship was common in daylight. Sometimes whole villages escaped together. According to an early Commissioner of Afghan Refugees, camps were created just wherever the refugees stopped. There was no government plan for camp locations. The refugees found their own spaces, whether near the border or further "inland" like in Haripur. [1]

Monthly refugee data issued by SAFRON and Commissioner of Afghan Refugees [Annex 3] lists population figures by camp and district or agency. From this document we can see that there 166 camps in the settled districts and 92 in the tribal agencies.

In other words, there still are 258 refugee camps (or Refugee Tented Villages (RTVs) as they are sometimes called). SAFRON and UNHCR documents are beginning to show what they call "merged camps". This is for administrative purposes only, the camps are not actually merged. The 258 camps are now administered as 119 units.

Table 1 shows how about half the refugees have gone home. This does not necessarily mean that half the camps have closed. UNHCR spokesmen say they can not state how many -if any- camps have closed as in many cases, camps run into one another and boundaries have never been definite. However, it is general knowledge now that large sections of many camps have been vacated. Two years ago, this consultant returned to a camp which I had known for eight years. Locally known as Akora Khattak, the camp by then was almost unrecognizable, so many people had left. On leaving, all refugees pull the wooden poles out of their roof structure to take the poles home. The roof then collapses, the mud walls fall in and nature takes over again. Very quickly, there is not much trace of houses at all. In rainy season, they melt back into the landscape.

---

[1] Interview with former Chief Commissioner of Afghan Refugees (1984-85), Mr. Farid Ullah Khan, now Director General of the NWFP Environmental Protection Agency.

Jane Thomas, Consultant جین تامس مشاور
G.P.O Box 1289, Peshawar, Pakistan. Tel: (521) 42764

Ecological Fact Finding Study Report

Effects Of Afghan Refugees On Pakistan

January 1995

For Swiss Development Corporation